

**REMARKS**

In the present amendment, claims 1, 5, 6 and 8 have been amended, claims 7 and 15 have been cancelled, and new claims 17 and 18 have been added for the Examiner's consideration.

Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended by adding the features of now cancelled claim 7 (as well as some clarifying amendments). Furthermore, claims 5 and 8 have been amended to address the indefiniteness rejections under 37 C.F.R. § 112, second paragraph, and to even further comply with idiomatic English and standard U.S. practice. Additionally, by the present amendment, claim 6 has been presented in independent form including the features of original claim 1 and previously presented claim 7 (as well as some clarifying amendments).

New claims 17 and 18 have been added to depend from independent claim 6, and recite the features of original claims 2 and 3.

No new matter has been added.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph**

The Office Action rejects claims 5 - 8 and 14 - 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. More specifically, with regard to claims 6, 14 and 16, the Examiner asserts claim 6 is unclear in light of its dependence upon claim 1. With regard to claim 5, the Examiner asserts claim 5 fails to further modify claim 1. With regard to claims 7 and 15, the Examiner asserts it is not clear to which resin claim 7 is referring. With regard to claim 8, the Examiner asserts it is not clear what components are required for the resin solution. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

With regard to claims 6, 14 and 16, by the present amendment, Applicants have amended claim 6 into independent form, by incorporating the features of original claim 1 and previously

presented claim 7 (and including amendments to address the indefiniteness rejections with respect to original claim 1, previously raised in the Non-Final Office Action dated February 23, 2010). As such, Applicants respectfully submit claim 6 no longer recites the conflicting ranges of parts by weight, and is not indefinite.

With regard to claim 5, Applicants have amended claim 5 to provide proper antecedent basis. Applicants submit claim 5 further modifies the invention of claim 1 and is not indefinite.

With regard to claim 7, Applicants note that by the present amendment, claim 7 has been canceled and the features of claim 7 have been incorporated into independent claim 1. As such, in order to address the rejection to previously presented claim 7, Applicants further amended claim 1 to specify the “resin flow” is of the ultra-thin primer resin layer. Accordingly, Applicants submit claim 1 (including the features of previously presented claim 7) is not indefinite.

With regard to claim 8, Applicants have amended claim 8 to more clearly recite the features of the presently claimed invention. In view of the amendment to claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit claim 8 is not indefinite.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 5 - 8 and 14 - 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, and indicate that claims 5, 6, 8, 14 and 16 (and claim 1, in view of the rejection of previously presented claim 7) are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by JP 2003-229648 [hereinafter JP '648]. With the present response, Applicants submit a verified translation of priority document JP2003-277428 to complete the chain of priority.

Applicants invite the Examiner to review the translation to determine its effect on the outstanding rejection.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Office Action makes the following rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

- claims 1 - 3, 5, 9 - 11 and 13 as allegedly being unpatentable over JP '648 in view of Hosogane et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,439,986);
- claims 1-3, 5, 8 - 11 and 13 as allegedly being unpatentable over Poutasse et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,522,433), hereinafter "Poutasse II," in view of Hosogane et al.

JP '648 in view of Hosogane et al.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1 - 3, 5, 9 - 11 and 13 over JP '648 in view of Hosogane et al., for the reasons articulated above, Applicants invite the Examiner to review the translation to determine its effect on the outstanding rejection.

Poutasse II in view of Hosogane et al.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 8 - 11 and 13 as allegedly being unpatentable over Poutasse II in view of Hosogane et al., Applicants note that in an attempt to advance prosecution of the present application, and without expressing agreement with or acquiescence to the rejection, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of now cancelled claim 7. Applicants note that claim 7 has not been rejected over JP'648, Poutasse II, or Hosogane et al. (alone or in combination).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 8 - 11 and 13 over Poutasse II in view of or Hosogane et al.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of record, and allow each of the pending claims. Applicants therefore respectfully request that an early indication of allowance of the application be indicated by the mailing of the Notices of Allowance and Allowability.

If there should be any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Tetsuro SATO et al.

*Sean Mlynarcik*  
William S. Boshnick  
Reg. No. 44,550 *42,920*

October 22, 2010  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191